

**The Economic Contributions of Two Saltwater Angling
Tournaments: The Case of the Faux Pas and R.F.R.I. Fishing
Rodeos in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana**

By
Jack Coburn Isaacs and
Yeong Nain Chi
Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
Socioeconomic Research and Development Section

Baton Rouge, Louisiana
February, 2006

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Table of Contents	i.
List of Tables	ii.
List of Figures	iii
Acknowledgements	iv.
 The Economic Contributions of Two Saltwater Angling Tournaments: The Case of the Faux Pas and R.F.R.I. Fishing Rodeos in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana	
Introduction	1
Case 1: The Faux Pas Fishing Invitational Rodeo, Venice	5
General Fishing Practices	7
Respondents' Experience with the Faux Pas Rodeo	8
Fish Species Targeted and Caught	11
Activities, Party Size, Lodging, Transportation, and Mode of Fishing ..	16
Qualitative Experience at the Rodeo: Satisfaction and Agreement	20
Personal Characteristics	25
Fishing Rodeo Related Expenditures	28
The Faux Pas Rodeo: Conclusions and Observations	35
Case 2: The Recreational Fishing Research Institute Rodeo, Port Sulphur	39
General Fishing Practices	39
Respondents' Experience with the R.F.R.I. Rodeo	40
Party Size and Activities	42
Fish Species Targeted and Caught	43
Mode of Fishing, Transportation, and Lodging	47
Qualitative Experience at the R.F.R.I. Rodeo:	
Satisfaction and Agreement	49
Personal Characteristics	54
Fishing Rodeo Related Expenditures	57
The R.F.R.I. Rodeo: Conclusions and Observations	64
The Economics of Two Fishing Rodeos in Plaquemines Parish:	
Summary and Conclusions	65
Appendix: Questionnaires	
Questionnaire for the Seventh Annual Faux Pas Invitational	
Rodeo Survey	71
Questionnaire for the 2004 R.F.R.I. Fishing Rodeo Survey	81

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
<u>Case 1. The Faux Pas Invitational Rodeo, Venice</u>		
Table 1	Number of Years of Angling Experience by 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents	7
Table 2	Number of Days Spent Freshwater and Saltwater Angling by 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents	8
Table 3	Number of Previous Times that 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents Have Participated in the Faux Pas Rodeo	8
Table 4	Additional Fishing Rodeos in which 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents Participated	10
Table 5	Number of Days Spent Fishing in the Venice Area by 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents	11
Table 6	Number of People, Including the Respondent, Traveling to Venice with 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents	17
Table 7	Agreement with Statements Regarding the Faux Pas Rodeo, 2004	23
Table 8	Household Size Distribution of 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents: Number of Residents in Respondent's Household (including Respondent)	25
Table 9	Age Distribution of 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents	25
Table 10	Average Expenditures per Purchaser and Participant, by Item	30-32
<u>Case 2. The R.F.R.I. Rodeo, Port Sulphur</u>		
Table 11	Number of Years of Angling Experience by R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents	39
Table 12	Number of Days Spent Freshwater and Saltwater Angling by R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents	39
Table 13	Number of Previous Times that 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents Have Participated in the R.F.R.I. Rodeo	40
Table 14	Additional Fishing Rodeos Attended by 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents and Number Participating	41
Table 15	Number of Days Spent Fishing in Port Sulphur-Area by 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents	42
Table 16	Number of People Traveling to Port Sulphur with 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents	42
Table 17	2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents Accompanying a Junior Division Participant	42
Table 18	Agreement with Statements Pertaining to the 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo	49
Table 19	Age Distribution of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents	54
Table 20	Household Size Distribution of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents: Number of Residents in Respondent's Household (including Respondent) ..	54
Table 21	Average Expenditures per Purchaser and Respondent by Item	58-60

List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
<u>Case 1. The Faux Pas Invitational Rodeo, Venice</u>		
Figure 1	Location of Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana: Sites of the Faux Pas and R.F.R.I. Rodeos	2
Figure 2	Number of 2004 Participants Who Participated in Previous Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents, By Rodeo Year	8
Figure 3	Number of Additional Rodeos Attended by 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents	9
Figure 4	Number of Participants by Species Category	12
Figure 5	Most Targeted Species by Species Category: First-Most, Second-Most and Third-most Targeted	13
Figure 6	Most Caught Species by Species Category: First-Most, Second-Most and Third-most Caught	14
Figure 7	Coincidence of Targeted Species among the Angler's First-Most, Second-Most, or Third-Most Caught Species	15
Figure 8	"Calcutta" Wager System Participation	17
Figure 9	Number of People Accompanying 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents who Did <u>Not</u> Fish (Non-Anglers)	17
Figure 10	Activities of Non-Anglers during Faux Pas Rodeo	18
Figure 11	Mode of Transportation to Faux Pas Rodeo, 2004	18
Figure 12	Lodging Arrangements of 2004 Faux Pas Respondents	19
Figure 13	Mode of Fishing by 2004 Faux Pas Respondents	20
Figure 14	Agreement with Statements Regarding the Faux Pas Rodeo, 2004	21-22
Figure 15	Level of Satisfaction with the 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo	24
Figure 16	Plans by 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents to Attend the 2005 Faux Pas Rodeo	25
Figure 17	Gender of 2004 Faux Pas Respondents	26
Figure 18	Residence for 2004 Faux Pas Respondents	26
Figure 19	Education of 2004 Faux Pas Respondents	27
Figure 20	Household Income of 2004 Faux Pas Respondents (in Thousands)	28
Figure 21	Expenditures of 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents, by Item	30-32
Figure 22	Spending in Venice by Visitors, Faux Pas Respondents who Live Outside Plaquemines Parish	33
<u>Case 2. The R.F.R.I. Rodeo, Port Sulphur</u>		
Figure 23	Number of Participants in Previous R.F.R.I. Rodeos by 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents, By Year	40
Figure 24	Number of Additional Fishing Rodeos Attended by R.F.R.I. Respondents	41
Figure 25	Activities Besides Fishing in Which R.F.R.I. Respondents Participated	43

List of Figures (Continued)

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
Figure 26	Most Targeted Species by Species Category: First-Most, Second-Most, and Third-Most Targeted	44
Figure 27	Most Caught Species by Species Category: First-Most, Second-Most, and Third-Most Caught	45
Figure 28	Coincidence of Targeted Species among the Angler's First-Most, Second-Most, or Third-Most Caught Species	46
Figure 29	Fishing Mode of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents	47
Figure 30	Mode of Transportation to 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo.....	48
Figure 31	Lodging of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents	48
Figure 32	Agreement with Statements Pertaining to the 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo	50-51
Figure 33	Level of Satisfaction with the 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo	53
Figure 34	Plans by 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents to Attend the 2005 R.F.R.I. Rodeo	53
Figure 35	Gender of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents	54
Figure 36	Residence for 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents	55
Figure 37	Education of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents	56
Figure 38	Household Income of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents (in Thousands)	56
Figure 39	Expenditures of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents, by Item	58-60
Figure 40	Spending in Port Sulphur by Visitors, R.F.R.I. Respondents who Live Outside Plaquemines Parish	62

Acknowledgements

This report is the product of the labors and contributions of Dr. Jorge Icabalceta and Mr. Herb Holloway of the Socioeconomic Research and Development Section. A special word of thanks is owed to Mr. Randy Pausina of the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, Marine Fisheries Division and Mr. Kleo Blue of the Faux Pas Lodge for their cooperation in implementing the survey and for their help in coordinating the resources needed to complete this study. Gratitude for their support is extended to Ms. Janice Lansing, Undersecretary, and to Mr. David Lavergne, economist administrator and adviser on this project.

Cost Statement

Fifty (50) copies of this report were printed at a cost of \$223.67. This document was compiled, prepared, and printed by the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, Office of Management and Finance, 2000 Quail Drive, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808.

The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries follows a non-discriminatory policy in programs and employment.

The Economic Contributions of Two Saltwater Angling Tournaments: The Case of the Faux Pas and R.F.R.I. Fishing Rodeos in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana

Introduction

Louisiana's claim to be the "sportsman's paradise" is arguably supported by the size and extent of its saltwater recreational fishery. According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 386,000 Louisiana residents and 118,000 non-residents participated¹ in saltwater fishing in Louisiana in 2001, spending, collectively, 4.7 million angling days and \$279 million in the state. A more recent estimate of participation from the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries licensing data counts 336,398 resident and 90,478 non-resident recreational saltwater fishing license holders in fiscal year 2004².

Most of the saltwater recreational activity takes the form of groups of family and friends or of the solitary individual fishing for food, recreation, or relaxation. Periodically, however, recreational angling assumes a more collective or even competitive form: fishing tournaments or, in the local parlance, rodeos, in which anglers match their luck and skill against others in catching fish for recognition or reward.

Louisiana has a plethora of such rodeos, at least 60 in 2004, assuming many formats and functions. Some are large; some are small. Some last a few hours; some last a few months. Some offer cash prizes; some offer nothing but a trophy or, failing that, bragging rights. They are as variable as the people and communities that host them, united only by the participants' and organizers' fondness for fishing.

The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Socioeconomic Research and Development Section (Socioeconomics Section) believes that many of these rodeos offer


¹ The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's participation estimates include only those anglers 16 years or older.

² The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries license statistics do not include anglers younger than 16 and older than 64 who are exempt from licensing requirements.

not only recreational opportunities to the people who attend them, but also economic opportunities to the communities in which they are held. A fuller assessment of the rodeos' participants would broaden the understanding of the people who attend these functions and the economic contribution they bring to Louisiana's communities. Since many of the fishing rodeos' participants do not reside in the events' host communities, their expenditures create an additional economic resource that may not otherwise have been available in these areas.

With the help of the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Marine Fisheries, the Socioeconomics Section identified two saltwater fishing rodeos for examination in the summer of 2004. Both were held in Plaquemines Parish (Figure 1), situated at the mouth of the Mississippi River, with an area of 845 square miles and a 2003 population of 28,025 residents (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005).

**Figure 1. Location of Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana
Sites of the Faux Pas and R.F.R.I. Rodeos**



The Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Rodeo is a private tournament organized by the Faux Pas Lodge. It has been held in Venice, Louisiana, at the southern tip of the parish, since 1998, and concentrates on the pursuit of off-shore species.

The Recreational Fisheries Research Institute (R.F.R.I.) Fishing Rodeo is a younger and, thus far, smaller tournament, which originated in 2002. The principal purpose of the tournament is to raise interest, support, and funding for the eponymous institute, an organization that seeks to enhance the understanding of and improve the quality of fishing in the Gulf of Mexico. The R.F.R.I. Rodeo offers awards for several species of fish that can be harvested in both near-shore and inshore waters.

Socioeconomics Section personnel began the research process by contacting the rodeos' organizers to discern their interest in participating in the surveys. Both organizing groups allowed the Economics Section to conduct their surveys and lent valuable assistance in the drafting of the questionnaires.

The Socioeconomics Section developed different but similar surveys for each rodeo (Appendix). Both questionnaires were comprised of four sections. The first section contained questions centered on general angler activity and experience. The second focused on various aspects of the rodeos themselves, including the anglers' expenditures on a number of items at the local and statewide level. The third section contained questions regarding the anglers' personal characteristics, such as age, household size, gender, education, and income. The fourth section contained no specific questions but invited open comments on any topic that appealed to the respondents.

The responses to these surveys are examined in the following pages. The results will show that both rodeos drew into Plaquemines Parish scores of anglers, most of them

men and most of them residents of southeastern Louisiana. They are for the most part avid anglers who spend more time fishing in saltwater – and less time fishing in freshwater - than the majority of Louisiana anglers. They also have more formal education and higher household income than most Louisianans.

This report will also detail the respondents’ rodeo-related expenditures, the “economic contribution” of visitor anglers at the parish and state level. (This is not the same as the “economic impact,” the total effect on the community as the money is spent and distributed throughout the local economy.) It will reveal how much money is spent in two Plaquemines Parish towns and elsewhere in Louisiana and show what portions are spent on specified categories of goods and service.

Each event and its participants are unique. Thus, the two case rodeos examined here should not be treated as typical or representative of all fishing rodeos in Plaquemines Parish and elsewhere in Louisiana. Nevertheless, they demonstrate the potential for fishing rodeos to act as economic contributors to local economies.

Case 1: The Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Rodeo, Venice

The Seventh Annual Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Rodeo was held at the Venice Marina, on July 23-25, 2004. Focusing on the pursuit of near-shore and off-shore fish species, it offered the opportunity to win trophies in several species categories and, in a connected wager pool, a “Calcutta,” the opportunity for cash prizes.

Registration is made by “captains” who pay a fee to enter their boats into competition. Several people, some of who are not registered or otherwise known to the event organizers, may fish from one vessel. Consequently, there is not a precise count or identification of individual anglers participating in the rodeo.

The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Socioeconomics Section made several efforts to publicize the survey and to explain its purpose to the Faux Pas Rodeo participants. Two members of the Economics Section attended the rodeo’s “captains’ meeting” in Metairie, Louisiana, on July 20, 2004 where they met a number of anglers and inserted fliers into packages that would be distributed to the anglers at the rodeo. On Saturday, July 24, three staff members traveled to Venice to observe the rodeo, inform anglers of the goals of the economic survey, and request their participation. The Socioeconomics Section incorporated many of the comments and suggestions obtained from anglers and organizers at these occasions into the economic survey.

The research deployed an eight-page questionnaire divided into four parts (Appendix). The first section contained three questions asking for the respondents’ overall fishing experience. The second section contained sixteen questions related to the respondents’ experience at the 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo. Among these questions was a detailed listing the respondents’ expenditures on numerous items in Venice and

elsewhere in Louisiana. The third section requested the respondents' personal characteristics. The fourth section was intended for open comments.

Because each individual angler was not required to register or provide a name and address, it was difficult to obtain a precise enumeration of the participants. The Economics Section obtained names and addresses from two sources: the on-site registration list of 127 names and the Faux Pas Lodge's mailing list of 320 names and addresses. Problematically, many of the people on the mailing list did not participate in the 2004 rodeo. Questionnaires were sent to this list anyway in order to obtain a cross-section of participants broader than the on-site registration list that was made predominantly of boat captains. This provided the researchers a larger number of angler participants but, unfortunately, reduced the ability to calculate an accurate response rate.

Of the 127 names from the on-site registration list, there were 39 completed and returned questionnaires and one undeliverable questionnaire. The response rate among on-site registration population was 30.95 percent.

There were 32 completed and returned questionnaires from the Faux Pas Lodge's mailing list. Finding a precise return rate from this segment is difficult but several steps were taken to come up with a range of response rates. Omitting 52 undeliverable questionnaires and 2 duplicates reduces the Faux Pas mailing list population to 266.

Next, Socioeconomics Section personnel found telephone numbers of 161 people with the names and addresses of the people on the mailing list. The Economics Section contacted 51 of the people and learned that 16 of them participated and 35 had not participated in the 2004 rodeo. This may be used to adjust the Faux Pas mailing list in two ways to devise a range of response rates.

The first method subtracts the 35 people who claimed in a telephone conversation not to have fished during the 2004 rodeo from the mailing list. This reduces the Faux Pas mailing list to 231. The 32 responses from the mailing list segment would thus equal a response rate of 13.9 percent.

The second method recognizes that 31.37 percent (16/51) of the people on the mailing list who were contacted by telephone fished in the 2004 rodeo. If this same percentage is assumed to apply to the entire non-returned mailing list, one may assume that 83 of the 266 people on the mailing list fished in the rodeo. Under these assumptions, the response rate is 39.02 percent (32/83).

Depending upon the method used to estimate the mailing list population, the overall response rate from the combined lists ranges from 18.07 percent to 33.97 percent.

General Fishing Practices

The typical Faux Pas Rodeo participant is an experienced and active fisherman. The anglers reported having fished for an average of 31.9 years (Table 1). The majority participate heavily in saltwater fishing, a median of 25 days in the year prior to the 2004 rodeo with relatively little freshwater fishing (Table 2). Over three-quarters (76.8 percent) did not go freshwater fishing at all during this period. The average number of freshwater fishing days for the entire sample is only 2.67 days. Among those who reported freshwater fishing in the previous year, the average is 11.5 days.

Table 1. Number of Years of Angling Experience by 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Years	2	60	31.9	30	30

Table 2. Number of Days Spent Freshwater and Saltwater Angling by 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents, 2004

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Freshwater Days	0	30	2.67	0	0
Saltwater Days	1	150	30.8	25	30


Respondents' Experience with the Faux Pas Rodeo

The year of the survey (2004) was not the first time that most of the respondents had attended the Faux Pas Rodeo. Only 14.5 percent said that 2004 was the first time that they had attended the Faux Pas Rodeo. The average respondent has participated in the Faux Pas Rodeo 3.39 years (Table 3). The first two years of the rodeo (1998 and 1999) were the most commonly cited by those who had previously attended the festival (Figure 2).

Table 3. Number of Previous Times that 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents Have Participated in the Faux Pas Rodeo

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Previous Visits	0	6	3.39	4	6

Figure 2. Number of 2004 Respondents Who Participated in Previous Faux Pas Rodeos, By Rodeo Year



Faux Pas Rodeo respondents reported having fished in 54 other rodeos (Table 4). Nearly two-thirds (63.8 percent) of the respondents participated in at least one other angling competitions in addition to the Faux Pas Rodeo (Figure 3). Approximately one-quarter fished in one other rodeo. A similar portion fished in two or three other rodeos.

Figure 3. Number of Additional Fishing Rodeos Attended by 2004 Faux Pas Respondents




Table 4. Additional Fishing Rodeos in which 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents Participated.

Rodeo	Part*	Rodeo	Part*
Baton Rouge Big Game Fishing Club Tournament	6	New Orleans Big Game Fishing Club Tournament	13
Bau Point	1	New Orleans Ladies	
Breton Island	2	Invitational	2
Big Game Invitational	1	Orange Beach Tournament	3
Boat Stuff Boat Owners Tournament	3	PHCC	1
Boothville-Venice Fire Dept Rodeo	1	Port Eades	1
Brother Martin High School Rodeo	2	Pourciau Rodiau (Family)	1
Carminada Redfish	1	Red Eye Classic	
Carter and Sons	1	Redfish Cup (Louisiana)	2
CCA Star Rodeo	1	Redfish Cup (FL, TX)	1
Clactracal Classic	1	Redfish Tour (Louisiana)	1
Cypress Cove	3	Redfish Tour IFA	
Cypress Rod and Gun Club	1	(Jacksonville)	1
Dall O Due	1	Redfish Tour IFA	
Empire Rodeo	11	(Punta Gorda)	1
ESPN Redfish Tournament (Texas)	2	Redfish Tour IFA (Key Largo)	1
ESPN Redfish Tournament (Florida)	1	Redfish Tour IFA (Titusville)	1
Fourchon IFA Redfish Tournament	1	Rummel High Tournament	2
Grand Isle Tarpon Rodeo	22	Shell Beach	1
Hard to Find	1	SKA	1
Home Building Rodeo	1	STAR Tournament	3
Hopedale IFA Redfish Tour	1	Take-a-Kid Fishing	1
Isle Capri Billfish	1	THOTH	1
Jesuit High School Fishing Rodeo	2	Tuna Rodeo (Venice)	1
Kajun Sportsman Kingmackerel	1	Venice IFA Redfish	1
Lafitte IFA Redfish Tournament	2	Venice Snapper Challenge	1
Local 60	2	West Delta Kingfish	
Mississippi Gulf Coast Classic	3	Tournament	1
Mobile Big Game Tournament	1	Y.M.B.C.	1
* Part. = Number of 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Attendees who Attended the Selected Rodeo			

The average number of days (11.5) in the previous year that respondents spent fishing in the Venice area, including during the rodeo itself, suggests that the area is widely and frequently fished (Table 5). From the median (4 days), it can be surmised that more than half of the respondents fished in the area beyond the three-day duration of the Faux Pas Rodeo. Nearly one-third (32.9 percent) of the respondents fished for ten (10) days or more in the area.

Table 5. Number of Days Spent Fishing in the Venice Area by 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents.


	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Previous Visits	0	90	11.5	4	3

Fish Species Targeted and Caught

The rodeo offered anglers the opportunity to enter their catch into any of nine competitive species categories, six off-shore (amberjack, cobia, dolphin, red snapper, tuna, and wahoo), two inshore (flounder and spotted seatrout) and one species commonly caught both off-shore and inshore (redfish, also called red drum). The angler with the heaviest fish in each category won a trophy, a one-of-a-kind sculpture by a local artist.

All but three respondents reported placing a fish in at least one competitive category. The vast majority of anglers entered multiple categories with an average of 3.73 categories per respondent. The most common species categories (Figure 4) were spotted trout (37 respondents) and redfish (35). A large portion submitted specimens into the tuna and flounder (32 each) and wahoo and dolphin (31 each) categories.


Figure 4. Number of Participants by Species Category



Anglers were asked which species they targeted or tried to catch during the rodeo with three levels of effort or intensity: first-most targeted, second-most targeted, and third most targeted. Almost all of the respondents (95.9 percent) identified a first most targeted species. Most also included a second-most targeted species (90.4 percent) or a third-most targeted species (83.6 percent).


The most common of the first-most targeted species (Figure 5) were spotted seatrout (19 citations), tuna (16), and red snapper (12). A different mixture of species was found among the common second-most targeted species: redfish (17), spotted seatrout (11), wahoo (9), and amberjack (9). The most common of the third-most targeted species were flounder (19) and dolphin (10). Neither was included by many respondents in the first-most or second-most targeted categories.

**Figure 5. Most Targeted Species by Species Category:
First-Most, Second-Most, and Third-Most Targeted**



Respondents were also asked in a separate question to identify the first-most, second-most, and third-most *caught* species (Figure 6). Virtually all respondents (95.9 percent) identified a first-most caught species. More than three-quarters (78.1 percent) also identified a second-most caught species. Nearly three in five (58.9 percent) listed a third-most caught species.

**Figure 6. Most Caught Species by Species Category:
First-Most, Second-Most, and Third-Most Caught**




The most common of the first-most caught species were spotted seatrout (16), red snapper (13), and dolphin (9). Among the most common of the second-most caught species were redfish (12), spotted seatrout (10), and amberjack (9). Dolphin with nine (9) citations was the most common of the third-most caught species, followed by tuna (6) and wahoo (5).

Researchers compared the respondents' list of first-most, second-most, or third-most targeted species to his or her list of most caught species to see which were named – or “coincided” - on both lists (Figure 7). Using this method, they concluded that the majority of anglers were able to catch the fish for which they were aiming.


Figure 7 reveals that the coincidence of most-caught species and most-targeted species declined as interest in a species declined. For example, for over three-quarters (76.8 percent) of respondents, their first-most targeted species was also found among their first-most, second-most, or third-most caught species. For nearly two-thirds (63.6 percent) of the respondents, their second-most targeted species was also listed as first-

Figure 7. Coincidence of Targeted Species among the Angler's First-Most, Second-Most, or Third-Most Caught Species


First-Most Targeted Species



Second-Most Targeted Species



Third-Most Targeted Species



most, second-most, or third-most caught. Only half of the third-most targeted species were also listed on the respondents' first-most, second-most, or third-most caught lists.

Activities, Party Size, Lodging, Transportation, and Mode of Fishing

Another form of competition available for rodeo participants was the “Calcutta”, a wager system that offered the possibility of cash prizes based upon the type and size of fish that they entered into the competitive species categories. Roughly half (51.4 percent) reported participating in the Calcutta competition (Figure 8).

The number of people included in the respondent's traveling party, including the respondent, ranged from one to thirty with an average of 5.76 (Table 6). Most respondents attended the rodeo with one or more companion. Only one respondent came alone (party size = 1). Nearly two-fifths (39.7 percent) came in groups of three or four.

Traveling parties were composed primarily but not exclusively of anglers. One item on the questionnaire asked respondents to identify the number of “non-anglers”, people who came to the rodeo but did not fish (Figure 9). Over three-quarters of the respondents (76.8 percent) reported no “non-anglers” in their traveling parties. Among those parties that did include non-anglers, the number ranged from one to six. The most common activities of non-anglers were attending the rodeo's social events and riding in the boat with out fishing (Figure 10).

The vast majority (91.4 percent) of the Faux Pas respondents traveled to Venice exclusively by private vehicle (Figure 11). Some traveled using a combination of conveyances, including private and rented vehicles (1.4 percent) and airplane and private vehicles (5.7 percent).

Figure 8. "Calcutta" Wager System Participation




Table 6. Number of People, Including the Respondent, Traveling to Venice with 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
People	1	30	5.76	5	3

Figure 9. Number of People Accompanying 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents Who Did Not Fish (Non-Anglers)




Figure 10. Activities of Non-Anglers During Faux Pas Rodeo





Figure 11. Mode of Transportation to Faux Pas Rodeo, 2004



The plurality of respondents lodged solely in a camp (38.0 percent) during the rodeo (Figure 12). Nearly one-third of the respondents (32.4 percent) spent at least part of the time on the boat [“boat” and “hotel and boat”]. Roughly one-sixth (16.9 percent) spent at least part of the time in a hotel.

There were several modes of fishing used by Faux Pas Rodeo participants, all of which, due to its off-shore venue, included a boat (Figure 13). The most common mode of fishing was to use the respondent’s own boat (73.2 percent). The second most common mode was to fish from somebody else’s boat. Only a small portion of the respondents (4.2 percent) used a charter boat at any time during the rodeo.

Figure 12. Lodging Arrangements of 2004 Faux Pas Respondents





Figure 13. Mode of Fishing by 2004 Faux Pas Respondents




Qualitative Experience at the Rodeo: Satisfaction and Agreement

Following Ditton, *et al.* (2000), this survey incorporated a battery of questions intended to measure the degree of agreement or disagreement with twelve statements regarding the fishing rodeo on a five-point Likert scale (Figure 14). Six statements dealt with some qualitative aspect of the rodeo event (A, C, D, E, G, I). Three questions pertained to the quality of the fishing (B, H, J). Two questions related to the possibility of fishing skill development or recognition (F, K) and one question to the possibility of winning money (L).

The degree of agreement or disagreement among respondents for each item may be summarized by the weighted average, calculated by assigning a value ranging from “one” for “strongly disagreed” to “five” for “strongly agreed” (Table 7). A higher weighted average indicated a higher level of general agreement with the statement. By this standard, the highest level of agreement occurred for four items indicating general

Figure 14. Agreement with Statements Regarding the Faux Pas Rodeo, 2004



**Figure 14. Agreement with Statements Regarding the Faux Pas Rodeo, 2004
(Continued)**




Table 7. Agreement with Statements Regarding the 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo

Question	Weighted Average
A. I thoroughly enjoyed the rodeo.	4.68
B. I cannot imagine better fishing.	3.79
C. Rodeo staff were always helpful.	4.64
D. The rodeo was well worth the money spent to take this trip.	4.65
E. I would like to fish other rodeos like this one.	4.26
F. The main reason I competed was to gain recognition of my fishing skills	2.61
G. The lodging facilities in the local area met my needs.	3.73
H. I caught more fish than I expected in this rodeo.	2.59
I. I encountered more people in the rodeo than I expected.	3.52
J. I caught what I consider a “trophy” fish	2.17
K. My fishing skills were tested in this rodeo.	3.33
L. The opportunity to win money in this rodeo was important to me.	2.75

satisfaction with the rodeo (A, D) and its staff (C) and a willingness to return (E). Two other items pertaining to the qualitative aspect of the rodeo, the adequacy of lodging facilities (G) and the number of participants (I), recorded lower weighted averages. It should be noted, however, that these items were not under the control of the event organizers and bore an uncertain connection to overall satisfaction with the event.

The statements pertaining to the quality of fishing (B, H, J) received a mix of lower scores. These, too, do not necessarily indicate dissatisfaction with the event. First of all, if anglers in a rich fishing environment like Louisiana can indeed “imagine better fishing” (see item B), it is not to the detriment to the site and occasion at hand. Additionally, an angler whose catch during the rodeo did not exceed expectations (H) may have been pleased nevertheless with the actual catch or other aspects of the fishing experience. Finally, an angler who did not capture what is vaguely described in item J as a “trophy fish” may have not placed a high priority on the relatively rare event of catching an especially large specimen.

A large portion of the respondents indicated that their skills were tested during the rodeo (K) but few marked the testing of skills as an important motivation for participation (F). Further more, relatively few marked the opportunity to win money (L) as an important reason for participation.

Eight-ninths (88.8 percent) of the respondents were very or extremely satisfied (Figure 15). None were extremely or even slightly dissatisfied. A final indication of satisfaction can be encapsulated in the respondents' willingness to return. Omitting two non-responses, one-hundred percent of the respondents (Figure 16) have plans to attend the Faux Pas rodeo in 2005.

Figure 15. Level of Satisfaction with the 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo





Figure 16. Plans by 2004 Faux Pas Respondents to Attend the 2005 Faux Pas Rodeo



Personal Characteristics

Most of the Faux Pas Rodeo respondents were male (Figure 17) and lived in households of about three people, including the respondent (Table 8). The age of respondents (Table 9) ranged from 21 to 69 with an average of 46.9 years.

Except for two residents of Mississippi and one from Washington, D.C., most of the respondents lived in southeastern Louisiana. Nearly three-quarters of the Louisiana resident respondents (Figure 18) live in three parishes: Jefferson, Orleans, and Saint Tammany.

Table 8. Household Size Distribution of 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents:
Number of Residents in Respondent's Household (including Respondent)

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
People	1	6	2.93	3	2

Table 9. Age Distribution of 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Years	21	69	46.85	46	46

Figure 17. Gender of 2004 Faux Pas Respondents





Figure 18. Residence for 2004 Faux Pas Respondents



Faux Pas Rodeo respondents tend to be relatively well educated (Figure 19). More than half have a college degree or advanced degree. None had less than a high school diploma.

The respondents also had fairly high incomes (Figure 20). More than three-fifths (61.7 percent) reported a household income of more than \$100,000 per year. None had a household income of less than \$40,000 per year.

Figure 19. Education of 2004 Faux Pas Respondents





Figure 20. Household Income of 2004 Faux Pas Respondents (in Thousands)



Faux Pas Rodeo Related Expenditures

To gauge the nature and extent of the Faux Pas Rodeo attendees' spending, the questionnaire contained a series of questions soliciting the respondents' expenditures on twenty items organized into five categories: transportation (vehicle fuel), lodging, food, fishing costs, and miscellaneous costs. "Food costs" consisted of spending on groceries and restaurant meals. "Fishing costs" were comprised of expenditures on boat fuel and oil, boat repair, slip and launching fees, gear and tackle, bait, ice, fish cleaning, registration, and licenses. "Miscellaneous costs" included spending on gifts and such rodeo-related items as the Calcutta and raffle tickets.

To distinguish between the rodeo's economic contribution at the local and statewide level, respondents were asked to identify the location of the expenditure

incurrence as occurring in Venice, the site of the rodeo, or elsewhere in Louisiana. Figure 21 illustrates the summed expenditures for each of the twenty individual items, detailing the portion made in Venice (dark section of the bar) and elsewhere in the state (white section). For most items, except vehicle fuel, groceries, gear, and other fishing supplies, the larger portion of expenditures was made in Venice. The excess of total spending in Venice (\$59,327) over total spending made elsewhere in the state (\$20,295) suggests that the majority of the economic activity connected to the rodeo happens at the local level.

Table 10 shows the number of people incurring expenditures, purchasers, for each item. Average expenditures are expressed in two ways: the average expenditures made by those who actually bought said item (average per purchasers) and the average per survey respondent.

The most common expenses, those with the largest number of purchasers, in Venice were vehicle fuel (55 purchasers), groceries (48 purchasers), and ice (49 purchasers). The most common expenses elsewhere in Louisiana included fuel (38 purchasers), groceries (29 purchasers), and licenses (19 purchasers). The number of purchasers in Venice was larger than the number of purchasers elsewhere in Louisiana for all items, except vehicle fuel, for which there was an equal number of purchasers within and without Venice.

For purchases made in Venice, the items with the highest expenditures were boat fuel (\$20,037 or \$274.48 per respondent), registration (\$4,875 or \$66.82 per respondent), and groceries (\$4,362 or \$59.75 per respondent).

Figure 21. Expenditures of 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents, by Item




Table 10. Average Expenditures per Purchaser and Respondent, by Item						
In Venice						
	<u>Vehicle</u>					
	<u>Fuel</u>	<u>Lodging</u>	<u>Meals</u>	<u>Groceries</u>	<u>Licenses</u>	<u>Regis- tration</u>
Number Purchasing	38	22	39	48	25	25
Average per Purchaser	62.24	164.55	103.64	90.88	74.24	121.88
Average per Respondent	32.40	49.59	55.37	59.75	25.42	66.78
Elsewhere in Louisiana						
Number Purchasing	38	2	4	29	19	14
Average per Purchaser	74.79	1,025.00	43.75	176.03	20.95	104.79
Average per Respondent	38.93	28.08	2.40	69.93	5.45	20.10

**Figure 21. Expenditures of 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents, by Item
(Continued)**




Table 10. Average Expenditures per Purchaser and Respondent, by Item (Continued)						
In Venice						
	Boat Fuel	Repairs	Boat Slip	Launch	Gear	Bait
Number Purchasing	55	5	22	35	28	35
Average per Purchaser	364.31	125.40	142.77	16.31	91.32	65.71
Average per Respondent	274.48	8.59	43.03	7.82	35.03	31.51
Elsewhere in Louisiana						
Number Purchasing	13	3	1	1	17	4
Average per Purchaser	115.77	210.00	104.00	5.00	203.94	42.50
Average per Respondent	20.62	8.63	1.42	0.07	47.49	2.33

Figure 21. Expenditures of 2004 Faux Pas Rodeo Respondents, by Item (Concluded)





Table 10. Average Expenditures per Purchaser and Respondent, by Item (Continued)						
In Venice						
	<u>Ice</u>	<u>Fish Cleaning</u>	<u>Other Supplies</u>	<u>Raffle</u>	<u>Calcutta</u>	<u>Gifts</u>
Number Purchasing	49	5	18	14	19	10
Average per Purchaser	52.29	50.00	60.28	21.43	220.00	59.70
Average per Respondent	35.10	3.42	14.86	4.11	57.26	8.18
Elsewhere in Louisiana						
Number Purchasing	8	0	6	5	6	4
Average per Purchaser	15.88	----	191.67	13.00	71.67	151.25
Average per Respondent	1.74	0	15.75	0.89	5.89	8.29

Studies of the local economic impact of events or facilities frequently exclude residents of the parish or county in which they occur to measure the amount of money brought into the locale by people from outside the area. Following this practice, this research reexamines expenditures made of Faux Pas respondents in Venice by excluding the responses of four attendees who reside in Plaquemines Parish (Figure 22). These “visitors”, respondents who live outside the rodeo’s home parish, spent \$57,214 in Venice, an average of \$829.19 per visitor.

Many expenditure items were combined with similar goods and services into expense categories. Spending on groceries and restaurants comprise “food” expenditures. Angling trip-related expenditures, like licenses, registration, bait, and ice are aggregated into the “fishing cost” category, except for boat fuel expenditures which, because of their

Figure 22. Spending in Venice by Visitors, Faux Pas Respondents who Live Outside Plaquemines Parish



size, were treated as a unique category. Spending on gifts, raffle tickets, and the Calcutta were included in the “miscellaneous” category.

Food purchased at groceries and restaurants accounted for 14.2 percent of all expenditures. Vehicle fuel, though purchased in Venice by more than half of the respondents, amounted to only 3.8 percent of the expenditures.

Boat fuel, constituting more than one-third of all expenditures, is the largest category of expenditures in Venice. “Fishing costs” amounted to another third of total Venice expenditures. One may note, however, that one-third of fishing costs represent expenditures on licenses and registration of which a portion is likely to be removed from Venice by the entities to whom they are paid, the Faux Pas Rodeo organizers and the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries.

There is a similar complexity in interpreting the sum of expenditures in the miscellaneous categories. Almost all (88.5 percent) of the miscellaneous expenditures are attributed to the raffle and Calcutta. A portion of the proceedings from these games is likely to be removed from the community also by the winners and organizers. Thus, the inclusion of these items in the expenditure total may misrepresent the economic contribution of the rodeo to the Venice community.

Assuming that the survey respondents are representative of the population (the anglers who took part in the tournament), the total economic contribution of the rodeo to the Venice community may be found by multiplying the estimated spending per non-resident respondent (average expenditure per visitor) by the population size, the total number of anglers who resided outside Plaquemines Parish. The rodeo’s registration process, involving boat captains, instead of individual anglers, makes it difficult to arrive

at a precise population enumeration. A minimum population estimate of 149 can be calculated by adding the number of names from the on-site registration list (127) plus the number of respondents from the Faux Pas mailing list (32) and subtracting the number of respondents with addresses in Plaquemines Parish (4) and six Plaquemines Parish residents on the on-site registration list. The product of the minimum population estimate and the average spending per visitor (\$829.19) yields a total economic contribution of \$123,549.31.

A minimum total expenditures estimate for sites in Louisiana outside Venice may be calculated by multiplying the average expenditures per respondent outside Venice (\$278.01) by 159, the sum of the names on the on-site registration (127), plus the number of respondents from the Faux Pas mailing list (32). Thus the total rodeo-related expenditures elsewhere in Louisiana are \$44,403.59.

Because registration was required of boat captains, but not all anglers, the number of names on the registration lists is perhaps an underestimate of the number of participants. The Faux Pas Rodeo organizers believe that 500 to 600 individual anglers took part in the 2004 event. Using the lower of these (500), as the population estimate, the total economic contribution of the Faux Pas Rodeo may have been \$414,595 in Venice and \$139,005 elsewhere in Louisiana.

The Faux Pas Rodeo: Conclusions and Observations

The Faux Pas Rodeo has succeeded in drawing anglers to its off-shore fishing contest for the better part of a decade. In 2004, it attracted a crowd of experienced, active, and capable saltwater anglers to the remote coastal community of Venice,

Louisiana. Since relatively few of them live in Plaquemines Parish, their expenditures there represent an economic gain for the community of \$100,000 to \$400,000.

Many of the 2004 rodeo participants are repeat visitors to the tournament, having taken part in this tournament for an average of 3.39 times before 2004. All said they were satisfied with this year's rodeo and have plans to come again. Thus, the people who attended the 2004 event are likely to return, creating the possibility for future economic contributions to the community.

The characteristics of the Faux Pas respondents make them a desirable pool of visitors. Displaying fairly large annual earnings and a fairly high degree of formal education, the group is engaged in a pastime that frequently involves a variety of expenditures at the local or parish level.

The largest expenditure category at the local level was boat fuel. Other fishing costs, for things like gear, bait, boat slip fees, and registration, combine for the second-largest expenditure category.

There was relatively little money spent on lodging. Less than a third of the respondents (30.99 percent) reported any lodging expenditures. Three-quarters of the respondents stayed at a camp, in a private home, or on a boat during the rodeo, venues that may involve lower cash expenditures than hotel or other traditional tourism lodging facilities. (Only 11.4 percent reported spending any time in a hotel.) The majority of respondents (54 percent) thought that "lodging met their needs" and 38 percent were neutral.

The Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Rodeo is a unique event with a history of attracting and retaining off-shore active and skillful saltwater anglers. Its example may

not be representative for all rodeos. The examination of the expenditure pattern of other rodeos is needed to show how the potential for economic contribution potential varies with differences in the nature of the rodeos and their participants.

(This page was intentionally left blank.)

Case 2: The Recreational Fisheries Research Institute Fishing Rodeo, Port Sulphur

The Recreational Fisheries Research Institute (R.F.R.I.) Fishing Rodeo was held on August 20-22, 2004, at the Woodlands Plantation in Port Sulphur, Louisiana. The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Socioeconomic Research and Development Section (Socioeconomics Section) obtained the names and addresses of 88 fishing rodeo registrants and guests. The Socioeconomics Section mailed a questionnaire to anybody who provided the necessary contact information, including angling participants plus other attendees who enjoyed the rodeos social events without actually fishing in the rodeo. Excluding 14 youth registrants, the survey was sent to 74 people. Of these, 38 returned surveys (32 rodeo anglers and 6 who did not fish during the event) for a response rate of 51.4 percent.

General Fishing Practices

R.F.R.I respondents are, on average, active and experienced, reporting an average of 25.4 years of angling experience (Table 11). Respondents preferred saltwater to freshwater fishing (Table 12). In the year prior to the survey, respondents spent an average of 45 days saltwater fishing and 4.36 days freshwater fishing. The majority of respondents (61.1 percent) did not go freshwater fishing at all (number of freshwater fishing days = 0).

Table 11. Number of Years of Angling Experience by R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Years	0	60	25.4	25	20

Table 12. Number of Days Spent Freshwater and Saltwater Angling by R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Freshwater Days	0	60	4.36	0	0
Saltwater Days	0	165	45	30	0


Respondents' Experience with the R.F.R.I. Rodeo

The majority of respondents had fished in earlier R.F.R.I. rodeos (Table 13): 55.2 percent in 2002, 55.2 percent in 2003 (Figure 23), and 36.8 percent in both years. Slightly more than a quarter (26.3 percent) had not fished in the R.F.R.I. Rodeo prior to 2004.

Table 13. Number of Previous Times that 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents Have Participated in the R.F.R.I. Rodeo

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Previous Visits	0	2	1.11	1	1

Figure 23. Number of Participants in Previous R.F.R.I. Rodeos by 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents, By Year




Although R.F.R.I. respondents named twenty-one other rodeos in which they have participated (Table 14), the majority of respondents (52.6 percent) did not fish in rodeos beside the R.F.R.I. rodeos (Figure 24). The average number of additional rodeos among all respondents was less than one, 0.95. Among those respondents who reported participating in another rodeo, the average number of other rodeos was 2.

Table 14. Additional Fishing Rodeos Attended by 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents and Number Participating

Rodeo	Part*	Rodeo	Part.
B.R. Big Game Club Tournament	2	Jesuit High Rodeo	2
Battersen Dented Rodeo	1	Louisiana Dented Rodeo	1
Brother Martin Alumni	1	Lures and Liars Rodeo	2
BVVFD	1	New Orleans Big Game Tournament	2
C.C.A. Star Rodeo	1	Rummel Rodeo	1
Chef Rodeo	1	Save Our Lake	1
Empire South Pass Tarpon Rodeo	4	S.T.A.R.	1
Fais Do Do Rodeo	2	SW Louisiana	1
Faux Pas Invitational Rodeo	2	Toth Carnival Rodeo	1
Grand Isle Tarpon Rodeo	3	T-SL Rodeo	1
IFA Star Rodeo	3		
* Part. = Number of 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo Attendees who Attended the Selected Rodeo			

Figure 24. Number of Additional Fishing Rodeos Attended by R.F.R.I. Respondents



Most of the respondents (76.3 percent) spent three or fewer days fishing in the Port Sulphur area (Table 15), including during the rodeo itself (median = 3). A small number of respondents (six) who frequented the area for more than 100 days increased the average number of days in Port Sulphur to 10.3 days.

Party Size and Activities

Most respondents traveled to Port Sulphur in groups of three (average = 3.71; median = 3) (Table 16). Only four came without a companion.

Respondents took part in a number of activities besides fishing during the rodeo (Figure 25). Attending the rodeo-sponsored social event was the most common alternative activity. A number of respondents enjoyed visiting family and friends and riding in the boat without fishing.

Over one-quarter of the 32 angling respondents (28.13 percent) accompanied a junior division participant, an angler younger than 16 years old (Table 17). Among the parties containing a junior division participant, the average number of junior anglers was 3.1.

Table 15. Number of Days Spent Fishing in Port Sulphur Area by 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average*</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Days	0	160	10.3	3	3
* Average calculated omitting one respondent who resided in Port Sulfur					


Table 16. Number of People Traveling to Port Sulphur with 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
People	1	12	3.71	3	3

Table 17. 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents Accompanying a Junior Division Participant

Number of Respondents Parties including a Junior Division Participant = 9					
	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Number of Juniors	1	12	3.1	1	1

Figure 25. Activities Besides Fishing in Which R.F.R.I. Respondents Participated, 2004




Fish Species Targeted and Caught

Anglers were asked to identify their first-most targeted species as well as their second-most and third-most targeted species (Figure 26). Among the angling respondents, half (50.0 percent) pursued redfish as their first-most targeted species and 46.88 percent named spotted seatrout as the first-most targeted species. (One named both the redfish and spotted seatrout as the first-most targeted species.)


The same two species were named as the most common second-most targeted species: redfish (43.75 percent) and spotted seatrout (34.38 percent). Only 26 respondents identified a third-most targeted species. Half of these (50.0 percent) named flounder as their third-most targeted species.

**Figure 26. Most Targeted Species by Species Category:
First-Most, Second-Most, and Third-Most Targeted**




The most targeted species were also the most frequently caught (Figure 27). Half of the angling respondents reported redfish as the most caught species. Another 31.25 percent named spotted seatrout. These two species were also named, in equal numbers, as the second-most caught species: redfish (31.25 percent) and spotted seatrout (31.25 percent). The most common of the third-most caught species were flounder and sheepshead.

**Figure 27. Most Caught Species by Species Category:
First-Most, Second-Most, and Third-Most Caught**



There is a great deal of coincidence between the most-targeted and the most-caught species (Figure 28), meaning that the fish named as first-most targeted, second-most targeted, or third-most targeted also appear on the lists of the most caught-species. The vast majority of the anglers' first-most targeted species (87.5 percent) appeared on their lists of the most caught (first-most, second-most, or third-most caught). Over three-quarters (77.4 percent) included their second-most targeted species on their most caught lists. Slightly more than half (53.4 percent) reported their third-most targeted species among their most caught species.

Figure 28. Coincidence of Targeted Species among the Angler's First-Most, Second-Most, or Third-Most Caught Species



Mode of Fishing, Transportation, and Lodging

All R.F.R.I. Rodeo respondents reported fishing from a boat at least part of the time (Figure 29). Most reported fishing from a boat that he or she owned (59.38 percent) and many fished from a boat that somebody else owned (46.88 percent). (A few, 6.25 percent, fished from both his or her own boat as well as from somebody else's boat.) Some (12.5 percent) fished from a boat and from the shore during part of the rodeo.

All respondents traveled to Port Sulphur for the rodeo in a private vehicle (Figure 30). One came by airplane and private vehicle.

A plurality of respondents took lodging (Figure 31) at a camp (47.4 percent), a private cabin, trailer, or other fixed structure intended as lodging during hunting and fishing expeditions. About one-fifth lodged at a hotel and bed-and-breakfast (18.4 percent). A similar portion stayed at a private residence (18.4 percent). About ten percent stayed on the boat during the rodeo and some took no lodging.

Figure 29. Fishing Mode of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents




Figure 30. Mode of Transportation to 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo





Figure 31. Lodging of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents



Qualitative Experience at the R.F.R.I. Rodeo: Satisfaction and Agreement

The questionnaire contained a bank of twelve questions (Table 18), patterned after Ditton, *et al.* (2000), to ascertain the respondent's perspective on various aspects of the rodeo. Six of these statements pertained to assorted quality elements of the event (A, C, D, E, G, I), three to the quality of fishing (B, H, J), two to the ability of the rodeo to test anglers' fishing skills, and one to the importance of the mission of the R.F.R.I. as an inducement for participation (L).

The level of each respondent's agreement (Figure 32) with each statement (from "strongly disagree" to "neutral" to "strongly agree") was scored on a five-point Likert scale. Weighted averages for the statements were calculated by dividing the sum of the products of the value assigned to satisfaction level (ranging from one for every "strongly disagree" to five for every "strongly agree") by the number of responses to the statement. Weighted averages greater than four fall within the "agree to strongly agree" range. Those between three and four occur in the "neutral to agree" range and those between two and three in the "disagree to neutral" range.

Table 18. Agreement with Statements Pertaining to the 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo

Question	Weighted Average
A. I thoroughly enjoyed the rodeo.	4.54
B. I cannot imagine better fishing.	3.50
C. Rodeo staff were always helpful.	4.36
D. The rodeo was well worth the money spent to take this trip.	4.43
E. I would like to fish other rodeos like this one.	4.03
F. The main reason I competed was to gain recognition of my fishing skills	2.33
G. The lodging facilities in the local area met my needs.	3.53
H. I caught more fish than I expected in this rodeo.	3.11
I. I encountered more people in the rodeo than I expected.	3.33
J. I caught what I consider a "trophy" fish.	4.26
K. My fishing skills were tested in this rodeo.	3.09
L. I was motivated to participate in this rodeo because I support the mission of the sponsoring agency.	4.78

Figure 32. Agreement with Statements Pertaining to the 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo





Figure 32. Agreement with Statements Pertaining to the 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo (Cont.)



The majority of items pertaining to qualitative aspects of the rodeo fall within the “agree to strongly agree” range (A, C, D, E). The rodeo received weighted averages above 4.0 for helpfulness of its staff (C), for being worth the cost of participating (D), for being worthy of repeated (E), and for being thoroughly enjoyable (A). The adequacy of lodging facilities (G), an aspect beyond the direct control of the event organizers, fell within the “neutral to agree” range. Similarly, responses whether there were more people than expected at the rodeo (I) fell within the “neutral to agree” range. It is not clear whether respondents would be pleased or displeased by encountering more people than they expected.

Two of the three items relating to fishing quality fell in the “neutral to agree” range: catching more fish than expected (H) and an inability to imagine better fishing (B). The score for catching a trophy fish (J) falls within the “agree to strongly agree” range. It should be noticed, however, that only nine percent agree or strongly agree with this statement and 39 percent disagree or strongly disagree. The weighted average appears to be boosted by the large portion of neutral responses (52 percent).

The weighted average for whether the rodeo tested the respondent’s fishing skills (K) fell at the lower end of the “neutral to agree” range. Respondents did not seem to think that the testing of fishing skills was an important motivation of participation (F) (weighted average = 2.33).

Finally, a large number of respondents were attracted by the R.F.R.I.’s mission to investigate ways to improve recreational fishing opportunities. Virtually all (97 percent) agreed or strongly agree that this was a central motivation for their participation.

The stated level of satisfaction with the R.F.R.I. Rodeo was high (Figure 33); all were very or extremely satisfied (86.5 percent) or at least moderately satisfied (13.5 percent). The respondents' willingness to come back is another indication of satisfaction. Ninety-seven percent plan to return to the R.F.R.I. Rodeo in 2005 (Figure 34).

Figure 33. Level of Satisfaction with the 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo





Figure 34. Plans by 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents to Attend the 2005 R.F.R.I. Rodeo



Personal Characteristics

Most R.F.R.I. Rodeo respondents were men (Figure 35) with an average age of 41.43 years (Table 19). Most lived in southeastern Louisiana (Figure 36) in a household of approximately three people (Table 20). Most respondents came from three relatively heavily populated parishes in the New Orleans area: Orleans, Jefferson, and Saint Tammany. Seven resided in the Baton Rouge area: East Baton Rouge and Livingston Parishes. Three came from other states, Mississippi and California.

Table 19. Age Distribution of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Years	23	70	41.43	39	38

**Table 20. Household Size Distribution of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents:
Number of Residents in Respondent's Household (including Respondent)**

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mode</u>
People	1	5	2.73	3	2

Figure 35. Gender of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents





Figure 36. Residence for 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents



R.F.R.I. Rodeo respondents are on the whole well-educated (Figure 37). Nearly half (48.6 percent) hold a college or advanced degree. Another 40.5 percent have some college or technical school education. None had less than a high school education.

Respondents also reported high annual household incomes (Figure 38). Over half (54.3 percent) earned more than \$80,000. Over one-fifth (22.9 percent) had a household income of \$40,000 to \$79,999.

Figure 37. Education of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents





Figure 38. Household Income of 2004 R.F.R.I. Respondents (in Thousands)



Fishing Rodeo Related Expenditures

Respondents reported expenditures on twenty separate items organized in five broad categories: vehicle fuel, lodging, transportation, fishing costs, and miscellaneous costs (Figure 39). They also identified the location at which the expenditures were incurred, whether in Port Sulphur, the site of the rodeo, or elsewhere in Louisiana. The results reveal that the economic contribution of the R.F.R.I. Rodeo was primarily local. Respondents spent almost twice as much in Port Sulphur (total expenditures = \$10,842) than they did elsewhere in the state (total expenditures = \$4,373). The amount of money spent for individual items in Port Sulphur was usually larger than the amount spent elsewhere in the state, except for registration and license expenditures. Expenditures for four items, lodging, slip services, fish cleaning, and gifts, were incurred exclusively within Port Sulphur. No purchases of these items were made elsewhere in the state.

The most commonly purchased items (determined by the number of purchasers) in Port Sulphur were groceries (26 purchasers), ice (23 purchasers), and boat launch services (21 purchasers) (Table 21). Vehicle fuel, with 20 purchasers, was the most commonly bought items outside Port Sulphur, followed by registration (14 purchasers) and groceries (12 purchasers).

The items reporting the largest total expenditures, including all respondents, in Port Sulphur were groceries (\$1,690 or \$46.94 per respondent), meals (\$1,577 or \$43.81 per respondent), and lodging (\$1,454 or \$40.39 per respondent). In other areas of Louisiana, the items with the highest expenditures were registration (\$1,645 or \$45.62 per respondent), groceries (\$750 or \$20.83 per respondent), and vehicle fuel (\$599 or \$16.64 per respondent).

Figure 39. Expenditures of 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents, by Item




Table 21. Average Expenditures per Purchaser and Respondent, by Item						
In Port Sulphur						
	Vehicle Fuel	Lodging	Meals	Groceries	Licenses	Boat Gas
Number Purchasing	20	13	17	26	9	19
Average per Purchaser	42.55	111.86	92.76	65.00	15.11	47.50
Average per Respondent	23.64	40.39	43.81	46.94	3.78	31.28
Elsewhere in Louisiana						
Number Purchasing	20	0	6	12	11	6
Average per Purchaser	29.95	*	45.83	62.50	26.73	57.50
Average per Respondent	16.64	0	7.64	20.83	8.17	9.58

Figure 39. Expenditures of 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents, by Item (Continued)




Table 21. Average Expenditures per Purchaser and Respondent, by Item (Continued)					
In Port Sulphur					
	<u>Boat Slip</u>	<u>Launch</u>	<u>Gear</u>	<u>Bait</u>	<u>Ice</u>
Number Purchasing	5	21	11	18	23
Average per Purchaser	45.40	13.38	34.55	40.11	13.74
Average per Respondent	6.31	7.81	10.56	20.06	8.78
Elsewhere in Louisiana					
Number of Spenders	0	2	6	5	6
Average per Purchaser	*	13.50	32.50	30.20	11.83
Average per Respondent	0	0.75	5.42	4.19	1.97

**Figure 39. Expenditures of 2004 R.F.R.I. Rodeo Respondents, by
Item (Concluded)**




Table 21. Average Expenditures per Purchaser and Respondent, by Item (Concluded)					
In Port Sulphur					
	<u>Fish Cleaning</u>	<u>Registration</u>	<u>Raffle</u>	<u>Gifts</u>	<u>Other</u>
Number Purchasing	1	18	17	6	3
Average per Purchaser	25	47.50	35.71	50.83	96.67
Average per Respondent	0.69	23.75	16.86	8.47	8.06
Elsewhere in Louisiana					
Number Purchasing	0	14	2	0	0
Average per Purchaser	*	117.50	10.50	*	*
Average per Respondent	0	45.69	0.58	0	0


The fourth largest expenditure item in the Port Sulphur area was boat fuel (\$1,126 or \$31.28 per respondent). Boat fuel was also the fourth largest expenditure item elsewhere in Louisiana (\$345 or \$9.58 per respondent).

Total respondent expenditures were reassessed to examine the economic contribution of the R.F.R.I. Rodeo to the Port Sulphur area. Economic contribution studies usually include only the local expenditures of people who live outside the community, leaving out the expenditures of local residents. Local residents' spending represents a shifting around of money already in the community more than an infusion of "new" money from the outside. This research accordingly omitted the response of one angler who resided in Port Sulphur's home parish, Plaquemines, in calculating the rodeo's economic contribution to the area.

Figure 40 includes several composite categories. "Food" includes all spending on groceries and restaurants (meals). The "miscellaneous" category consists of spending on gifts and raffle tickets. "Fishing costs" includes trip-related angling expenditures like licenses, registration, boat repairs, slip and launching service fees, fishing gear, live bait, ice, and fish cleaning. (Boat fuel and gas is depicted as a separate expenditure category distinct from other fishing trip costs.)

Respondents who reside outside the parish spent over \$10,000 (\$289.63 per respondent) in Plaquemines Parish, a sum that would likely not have been spent in the community in the absence of the rodeo. The largest expenditure category, with 30.5 percent of all expenditures, was "food," comprised in roughly equal portions of spending on groceries and meals. "Fishing costs", the second largest category, consisted of

**Figure 40. Spending in Port Sulphur by Visitors, R.F.R.I.
Respondents who Live Outside Plaquemines Parish**



expenditures for eight trip-related items. Approximately two-thirds of the spending in the “fishing costs” category was dedicated to three items: registration fees, bait, and gear.

Vehicle and boat fuel expenditures collectively account for almost one-fifth (18.4 percent) of all R.F.R.I. Rodeo respondents’ spending in Port Sulphur. Lodging expenditures represent about one-seventh of all visitors’ spending (13.7 percent).

To compute the rodeo’s total economic contribution to the Port Sulfur area, one may extrapolate from the sample to population by multiplying the average spending per visitor by the number of participants who reside outside Plaquemines Parish. The registration system in place at the R.F.R.I. Rodeo generates a fairly conservative enumeration of the population of participants over eighteen years of age (74). (This

number may be somewhat low as it does not contain anglers who may have accompanied a registrant but did not officially register. Further, it may not include a complete count of those who traveled to the rodeo but did not fish during the tournament.) This number may be adjusted by subtracting the number (6) of registrants who resided in towns within Plaquemines Parish. The product of average spending per visitor times the number of non-resident registrants produces an estimated total economic contribution of \$19,694.84 to the Port Sulfur community.

An elaboration on the patterns of expenditures within the “fishing costs” category demonstrates some of the complexities of interpreting local economic contribution figures since a portion of the spending in this heading may not stay within the Port Sulphur community. One-third of fishing costs were apportioned to registration and license acquisition. These sums may be taken by the relevant collecting agency, the event organizers or state government, and thus do not go into the coffers of local businesses or government. In a similar vein, one-half of all “miscellaneous” expenditures were for raffle tickets, the proceeds of which are likely not to stay in the Port Sulphur community. The total economic contribution thus represents an aggregate measure of consumer spending and not a precise measure of local economic revenues.

The total economic contribution to other parts of the state may be found by multiplying the total average spending per respondent for elsewhere in Louisiana (\$115.08) by the number of registrants above the age of 18. Total spending by R.F.R.I. Rodeo participants outside Port Sulfur equals \$8,515.84.

The R.F.R.I. Rodeo: Conclusions and Observations

The R.F.R.I. Rodeo, in only its third year of operation, managed to attract scores of active and experienced saltwater anglers to Port Sulphur's Woodlands Plantation in spite of the August heat. In the course of a weekend of angling, they spent an estimated \$19,000 in Port Sulphur and \$8,000 elsewhere in the state.

Many of the characteristics of the R.F.R.I. Rodeo participants resemble the demographics of potential visitors sought by tourism promoters and economic development offices. They have a fairly high level of education and household income and a demonstrated willingness to spend money in the local economy. Further, they are likely to become "repeat visitors". Two-thirds had already fished in Plaquemines Parish during past R.F.R.I. Rodeos and 97.3 percent say that they would like to take part in the next year's of the tournament.

The nature and purpose of the Recreational Fishing Research Institute is a key attraction for many of participants. Over 97 percent agree or strongly agree that the mission of the sponsoring organization motivated them to participate. The operation of the rodeo itself seems to be another attraction. Even though relatively small portions captured "trophy fish" or caught more fish than they expected, they judged the rodeo to be thoroughly enjoyable and worth the money spent.

The R.F.R.I. Rodeo has the potential for future success as more people become acquainted with both the event and the research institution. If this potential is realized, the economic contributions of future editions of the rodeo may exceed that seen in 2004.

The Economics of Two Fishing Rodeos in Plaquemines Parish: Summary and Conclusions

The economic evaluation of two fishing rodeos in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana, demonstrates their potential to local economies. These tournaments together attracted 200 to 600 anglers and \$140,000 to \$450,000 to the parish over the course of two summer weekends. Major categories of expenditures were boat fuel and gas, fishing supplies, and food.

Respondents from both surveys spent a relatively small amount of their total spending on lodging. Most of the respondents from both surveys utilized forms of lodging, like private homes, camps, and boats that, in contrast to hotels, are not associated with the outlay of cash fees for overnight use.

It is not clear whether this lodging pattern is a product of preference or necessity. If participants choose private homes and camps instead of hotels because they are more convenient or conducive to their needs, the condition and capacity of local hotel establishments may have little effect on the economic contribution of the rodeo to the community. If, on the other hand, they use private homes and camps because of a perceived insufficiency in hotel availability, there is a possibility that altering area lodging infrastructure may have real implications for the infusion of economic resources into the community.

In the respondents' assessments, a slim majority of Faux Pas respondents and a plurality of R.F.R.I. respondents agreed that local lodging met their needs. In both cases, however, large portions - more than thirty-five percent- remained neutral in their opinion of local lodging availability.

Having made no formal analysis of the lodging infrastructure and anglers' needs in Plaquemines Parish, this research can offer no statements regarding the costs and benefits of improving hotel infrastructure in the area. It will, however, acknowledge that in locales with more plentiful hotel availability than that existing in Plaquemines Parish, a larger portion of the participants' expenditures may be apportioned to lodging.

The pool of participants is drawn largely from a relatively heavily populated three-parish area in the New Orleans area, just north of Plaquemines Parish. This area is also home to the sponsoring organizations for both rodeos that seemingly employ a certain degree of informal networking in identifying and contacting current and potential customers. Thus, it is not clear whether or how the tournaments might succeed in attracting participants from a wider geographic area.

The respondents from the Faux Pas and R.F.R.I. Rodeos hold some other similarities beyond geographic origin. Most are men between the ages of 35 and 45. They have more formal education than the overall population. They live in households of approximately three people.

Both groups display a certain "brand loyalty" to their respective tournaments, having attended the same rodeo in previous years. They are, for the most part, somewhat social in their tournament angling, traveling in groups of three to five people.

Both rodeos were attended by men who are much more active in saltwater fishing than the state average. The average number of saltwater fishing days was for Faux Pas respondents (30.67) and R.F.R.I. respondents (45) greatly exceeded the average for state resident anglers computed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (11 days).

Their fishing effort was disproportionately spent in saltwater fishing. Whereas the average Louisiana resident spent 15 days in freshwater fishing (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2002), the average number of freshwater fishing days was only 2.67 days for Faux Pas respondents and 4.36 days for R.F.R.I. respondents.

Beyond these similarities, there are differences between the rodeos' respondents that speak of the distinctions between the nature of the tournaments and their associated economic contributions. One telling difference is in the species targeted and captured: inshore species by R.F.R.I. Rodeo participants and off—shore species by Faux Pas participants. Relative to inshore fishing, pursuing off-shore species involves larger, seaworthy vessels that may demand higher expenditures, especially for boat fuel and oil. Accordingly, the average spending per Faux Pas visitor was almost three times that of the R.F.R.I. visitor. Average spending for boat fuel and oil for Faux Pas respondents was approximately nine times the average boat fuel and oil expenditures for R.F.R.I. respondents.

There were also significant differences in household income between the Faux Pas anglers and R.F.R.I. anglers that may also be related to differences in expenditures. A larger portion of the Faux Pas respondents (61.7 percent) than R.F.R.I. respondents (34.3 percent) reported household incomes above \$100,000. The portion of Faux Pas respondents with household income less than \$40,000 (10.3 percent) was less than half the corresponding portion of the R.F.R.I. respondents (22.8 percent).

Furthermore, the Faux Pas Rodeo attracted more participants than R.F.R.I. Rodeo. This, combined with a larger per visitor spending, means that the economic contribution of the Faux Pas Rodeo was many times larger than that of the R.F.R.I. Rodeo.

Every rodeo is unique. Differences in purpose, organization, targeted species, and participant profiles are likely to produce observable differences in the economic contributions that rodeos make to their respective communities. Further study of a variety of fishing rodeos in different areas of the state may shed light on what these differences are.


Appendix: Questionnaires

Questionnaire for the Seventh Annual Faux Pas Invitational Rodeo Survey
Pages 71 - 80

Questionnaire for the 2004 R.F.R.I. Fishing Rodeo Survey
Pages 81 - 91

(This page was intentionally left blank.)

The 7th Annual Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Fishing Rodeo Survey




Your information will be used to provide insight on the types of anglers who participated in competitive fishing events, their motivations, expenditures, and their overall economic impact.

Conducted by

**The
Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries**

With the Cooperation of

The Faux Pas Lodge Fishing Rodeo Organizers



Section 1: General Fishing Activity and Experience

Section 2: Fishing Rodeo Experience

Section 3: Personal Characteristics

Section 4: Comments and Suggestions

The 7th Annual Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Fishing Rodeo Survey

Section 1. General Fishing Activity and Experience

In the following questions, please tell us about your general fishing activities and experience.

1. Since this time last year, how many days did you go fishing in?
(If *NONE*, please enter 0)

Fresh Water _____ Days

Salt Water _____ Days

2. How many years have you been saltwater fishing?

_____ Years

3. Besides the Faux Pas Rodeo, which other saltwater fishing rodeos have you participated in?

Rodeo Name

City or Town

Section 2. Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Fishing Rodeo Experience

In the following section, you will be asked about your expenditures and experiences in the Venice area during your recent trip to the 7th Annual Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Fishing Rodeo in July, 2004.

4. Was this year's trip the first time you ever attended the Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Fishing Rodeo in Venice? (Please circle one.)

A Yes (If "Yes", please move to the next question.)
B No

Which of the Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Fishing Rodeo(s) have you attended? (Circle all that apply)

1998	1999	2000
2001	2002	2003

5. Which of the following fishing category did you participate in this rodeo? (Circle all that apply)

A Tuna
B Wahoo
C Dolphin
D Amberjack
E Cobia (Lemonfish)
F Red Snapper
G Redfish
H Speckled Trout
I Flounder

6. What type or species of fish were you targeting in this rodeo?

_____ Species targeted the most

_____ Species targeted the second most

_____ Species targeted the third most

_____ Did not target any specific species

7. What type or species of fish did you catch in this rodeo?

_____ Species caught the most

_____ Species caught the second most

_____ Species caught the third most

8. How many days did you spend fishing in the Venice area including this rodeo?

_____ Total fishing days

9. How many people, including yourself, came with you to the Faux Pas Rodeo?

_____ People (including yourself)

10. How many people who came with you did not fish to this rodeo?

_____ People who came with you but did not fish

What did they do while you fished? (Circle all that apply)

A Riding in boat, but not fishing

B Attending Social Events

C Visiting Family or Friends

D Sight Seeing

E Shopping

F Business

G Other _____

11. Did you participate in the Calcutta?

A Yes

B No

12. Which of the following forms of transportation did you use to reach the Venice area? (Circle all that apply)


- A Rode or drove in a private car, truck, or RV
- B Rented car, truck, or RV (Rental Fee: \$_____)
- C Airplane (Air Fare: \$_____)

13. Where did you lodge during the fishing rodeo?

- A Hotel or Motel
- B Camp or Rented Home
- C Private Residence
- D Stayed on the Boat

14. Which of the following methods did you use to participate in this fishing rodeo?

- A Used my own boat
- B Fished on someone else's boat
- C Charter (Guide/Charter Fee: \$_____)
- D Rented boat (Rental Fee: \$_____)



15. During your participation in the 7th Annual Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Fishing Rodeo, how much was YOUR SHARE spent on each of the following items for use in this trip even if you purchase everything initially?

	(In Venice)	(Elsewhere in Louisiana)
Transportation Costs		
Fuel for Car, Truck, or RV.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Lodging Costs		
Lodging.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Food		
Restaurant Meals.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Groceries, Snacks, and Drinks.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Fishing Costs		
Fishing Licenses.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Registration Fees.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Gas and Oil for Boat.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Boat Repairs.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Slip or Dockage Fees.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Boat Launch Fees.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Fishing Gears/Tackles.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Live Bait.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Ice.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Fish Cleaning.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Other Fishing Supplies (Ice Chest, Knife, Sunglasses, etc.).	\$ _____	\$ _____
Miscellaneous		
Raffle.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Calcutta.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Gifts or Souvenirs.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Other.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Anything else for this trip? (Please specify below)		
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____

16. If you traveled from outside of Louisiana to make this trip, how much did you spend on this entire trip in states other than Louisiana?

\$ _____ Total spent outside of Louisiana

17. How well do the following statements describe your feelings about your trip and participation in the 7th Annual Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Fishing Rodeo? Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following:

(Strongly Disagree =1; Moderately Disagree = 2; Neutral = 3; Moderately Agree =4; Strongly Agree =5)

		Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
A	I thoroughly enjoyed the rodeo.....	1	2	3	4	5
B	I cannot imagine better fishing	1	2	3	4	5
C	Rodeo staffs were always helpful	1	2	3	4	5
D	The rodeo was well worth the money spent to take this trip.....	1	2	3	4	5
E	I would like to fish other rodeos like this one	1	2	3	4	5
F	The main reason I competed was to to gain recognition of my fishing skills.....	1	2	3	4	5
G	The lodging facilities in the local area met my needs	1	2	3	4	5
H	I caught more fish than I expected to in this rodeo.....	1	2	3	4	5
I	I encountered more people in the rodeo than I expected.....	1	2	3	4	5
J	I caught what I consider a “trophy” fish.....	1	2	3	4	5
K	My fishing skills were tested in this rodeo..	1	2	3	4	5
L	The opportunity to win money in this rodeo was important to me.....	1	2	3	4	5

18. Overall, how satisfied were you with this rodeo? (Please circle only one)

- A Not at all Satisfied
- B Slightly Satisfied
- C Moderately Satisfied
- D Very Satisfied
- E Extremely Satisfied

19. Do you plan to attend the next Annual Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Fishing Rodeo in 2005?

- A Yes
- B No

Section 3. Personal Characteristics

The following questions will help us to know more about our respondents. The information you provide will remain strictly confidential and you will not be identified with your answers.

20. What is your home Zip code? _____
21. What is your age? _____ Years
22. What is your gender?
- A Female
 - B Male
23. How many people live in your household, including yourself?
- _____ People (Including yourself)
24. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
(Please circle only one)
- A Some Grade School
 - B Some High School
 - C Completed High School
 - D Some College
 - E Technical School
 - F Completed College
 - G Advanced Degree
25. What is your approximate household income before taxes?
- A Under \$20,000
 - B \$20,000 to \$39,999
 - C \$40,000 to \$59,999
 - D \$60,000 to \$79,999
 - E \$80,000 to \$99,999
 - F \$100,000 to \$119,999
 - G \$120,000 or Above


If you have any comments about the Faux Pas Lodge Invitational Fishing Rodeo or fishing in general, or about this survey, please write them in this section.

This image shows a blank sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and extend across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
Socioeconomic Research and Development Section
2000 Quail Drive
Post Office Box 98000
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70898
(225) 763-3562



The 2004 R.F.R.I. Fishing Rodeo Survey




Your information will be used to provide insight on the types of anglers who participated in competitive fishing events, their motivations, expenditures, and their overall economic impact.

Conducted by

**The
Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries**

With the Cooperation of

The R.F.R.I. Rodeo Organizers



Section 1: General Fishing Activity and Experience

Section 2: Fishing Rodeo Experience

Section 3: Personal Characteristics

Section 4: Comments and Suggestions

The Recreational Fisheries Research Institute Fishing Rodeo Survey

Section 1. General Fishing Activity and Experience

In the following questions, please tell us about your general fishing activities and experience.

1. Since this time last year, how many days did you go fishing?
(If *NONE*, please enter 0)

Fresh Water _____ Days

Salt Water _____ Days

2. How many years have you been saltwater fishing?

_____ Years

3. Besides the R.F.R.I. Rodeo, which other saltwater fishing rodeos have you participated in?

Rodeo Name

City or Town

Section 2. Recreational Fishing Research Institute Rodeo Experience

In the following section, you will be asked about your expenditures and experiences in the Port Sulfur area during your recent trip to the R.F.R.I. Fishing Rodeo in August, 2004.

4. Was this year's trip the first time you ever attended the R.F.R.I. Fishing Rodeo in Port Sulfur? (Please circle one.)

A Yes (If "Yes", please move to the next question.)
B No

Which of the R.F.R.I. Rodeo(s) have you attended? (Circle all that apply)

2002 2003

5. How many days did you spend in the Port Sulfur area including this rodeo?

_____ Total days

6. How many people, including yourself, came with you to the R.F.R.I. Rodeo?

_____ People (including yourself)

7. Did you fish in the R.F.R.I. Rodeo?

A Yes
B No

8. What activities besides fishing did you or your companions participate in during the R.F.R.I. Rodeo?
(Circle all that apply)

A Riding in boat, but not fishing
B Attending Social Events
C Visiting Family or Friends
D Sight Seeing
E Shopping
F Business
G Other _____

If you did NOT FISH in the 2004 R.F.R.I. Fishing Rodeo, please skip to question 14 (page 4)

9. Did your fishing party include anybody in the Junior Division (12 and younger)?

- A Yes (If "Yes", how many? _____)
B No

Species Included in the R.F.R.I. Rodeo

Black Drum
Flounder

Garfish
Redfish

Sheepshead
Speckled Trout

10. What type or species of fish were you targeting in this rodeo?

- _____ Species targeted the most
_____ Species targeted the second most
_____ Species targeted the third most
_____ Did not target any specific species

11. What type or species of fish did you catch in this rodeo?

- _____ Species caught the most
_____ Species caught the second most
_____ Species caught the third most

13. Which of the following methods did you use to fish in this rodeo?
(Circle all that apply.)


A Used my own boat
B Fished on someone else's boat
C Charter (Guide/Charter Fee: \$_____)
D Rented boat (Rental Fee: \$_____)
E Fished from shore

14. Which of the following forms of transportation did you use to reach the Port Sulfur area? (Circle all that apply)

A Rode or drove in a private car, truck, or RV
B Rented car, truck, or RV (Rental Fee: \$_____)
C Airplane (Air Fare: \$_____)

15. Where did you lodge during the fishing rodeo?

A Hotel or Motel
B Bed and Breakfast
C Camp or Rented Home
D Private Residence
E Stayed on the Boat



16. During your participation in the R.F.R.I. Fishing Rodeo, how much was YOUR SHARE spent on each of the following items for use in this trip even if you purchase everything initially?

	(In Port Sulfur)	(Elsewhere in Louisiana)
Transportation Costs		
Fuel for Car, Truck, or RV.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Lodging Costs		
Lodging.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Food		
Restaurant Meals.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Groceries, Snacks, and Drinks.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Fishing Costs		
Fishing Licenses.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Registration Fees.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Gas and Oil for Boat.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Boat Repairs.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Slip or Dockage Fees.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Boat Launch Fees.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Fishing Gears/Tackles.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Live Bait.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Ice.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Fish Cleaning.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Other Fishing Supplies (Ice Chest, Knife, Sunglasses, etc.).	\$ _____	\$ _____
Miscellaneous		
Raffle.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Gifts or Souvenirs.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Other.....	\$ _____	\$ _____
Anything else for this trip? (Please specify below)		
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____

17. If you traveled from outside of Louisiana to make this trip, how much did you spend on this entire trip in states other than Louisiana?

\$ _____ Total spent outside of Louisiana

18. How well do the following statements describe your feelings about your trip and participation in R.F.R.I. Fishing Rodeo? Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following:

(Strongly Disagree =1; Moderately Disagree = 2; Neutral = 3; Moderately Agree =4; Strongly Agree =5)

		Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
A	I thoroughly enjoyed the rodeo.....	1	2	3	4	5
B	I cannot imagine better fishing	1	2	3	4	5
C	Rodeo staffs were always helpful	1	2	3	4	5
D	The rodeo was well worth the money spent to take this trip.....	1	2	3	4	5
E	I would like to fish other rodeos like this one	1	2	3	4	5
F	The main reason I competed was to to gain recognition of my fishing skills.....	1	2	3	4	5
G	The lodging facilities in the local area met my needs	1	2	3	4	5
H	I caught more fish than I expected to in this rodeo.....	1	2	3	4	5
I	I encountered more people in the rodeo than I expected.....	1	2	3	4	5
J	I caught what I consider a “trophy” fish.....	1	2	3	4	5
K	My fishing skills were tested in this rodeo..	1	2	3	4	5
L	I was motivated to participate in this rodeo because I support the mission of the sponsoring organization	1	2	3	4	5

19. Overall, how satisfied were you with this rodeo? (Please circle only one)

- A Not at all Satisfied
- B Slightly Satisfied
- C Moderately Satisfied
- D Very Satisfied
- E Extremely Satisfied


20. Do you plan to attend the next R.F.R.I. Fishing Rodeo in 2005?

- A Yes
- B No

Section 3. Personal Characteristics

The following questions will help us to know more about our respondents. The information you provide will remain strictly confidential and you will not be identified with your answers.

21. What is your home Zip code? _____
22. What is your age? _____ Years
23. What is your gender?
- A Female
 - B Male
24. How many people live in your household, including yourself?
- _____ People (Including yourself)
25. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
(Please circle only one)
- A Some Grade School
 - B Some High School
 - C Completed High School
 - D Some College
 - E Technical School
 - F Completed College
 - G Advanced Degree
26. What is your approximate household income before taxes?
- A Under \$20,000
 - B \$20,000 to \$39,999
 - C \$40,000 to \$59,999
 - D \$60,000 to \$79,999
 - E \$80,000 to \$99,999
 - F \$100,000 to \$119,999
 - G \$120,000 or Above



**Thank you for you taking
the time to answer this
survey.**

**Your input will help us understand more
about the people who fish in Louisiana's
fishing rodeos ---**

**and help us calculate their contribution
to the economy.**

Section 4. Comments and Suggestions

If you have any comments about the Recreational Fisheries Research Institute Fishing Rodeo or fishing in general, or about this survey, please write them in this section.

This image shows a blank sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and extend across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.